



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/693,327	10/20/2000	Matthias Breuer	P-4352	8852
7590	09/09/2005		EXAMINER	
Forrest Gunnison Gunnison, McKay & Hodgson, L.L.P. 1900 Garden Road, Suite 220 Monterey, CA 93940			KINDRED, ALFORD W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/693,327

Applicant(s)

BREUER, MATTHIAS

Examiner

Alford W. Kindred

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE, filed on 07/21/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker et al., US# 2002/0073106 A1, in view of Gross et al., US# 6,918,082 B2.

As per claims 1 and 5-6, Parker et al. teaches "storing said at least one earlier version of said document in its entirety in a file . . ." (see page 6, paragraphs [0154]-[0157]) "storing said current version of said document in its entirety in said file" (see page 6, paragraphs [0154] and page 3, paragraphs [0073]-[0076]). Parker et al. does not explicitly teach "wherein said at least one earlier version and said current version are both in said file for subsequent use." Gross et al. teaches "wherein said at least one earlier version and said current version are both in said file for subsequent use" (see col. 2, lines 50-67 and col. 3, lines 1-9). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Gross and Parker above, because using the steps of "wherein said at least one earlier version and said current version are both in said file for subsequent use" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to store/process/display current or earlier versions of

document in an individual file simultaneously. This gives users the advantage of manipulating/store the versions of various documents in a more efficient manner.

As per claim 2, Parker et al. teaches "wherein said current version comprises historic information and each of said different versions . . ." (see page 2, paragraphs [0014]-[0015]) "said storing said at least earlier version includes storing historic information of said at least one earlier version . . ." (see page 6, paragraph [0148]-[0150]).

As per claim 3, Parker et al. teaches "displaying on demand of a user of said computer system . . . at least a portion of said historic information about said different versions of said document . . ." (see page 2, paragraphs [0014]-[0015] and page 3, paragraphs [0067]-[0074]).

As per claim 4, Parker et al. teaches "method is stored in a first memory . . ." (see page 1, paragraphs [0005]-[0006] and page 2, paragraphs [000015]).

As per claim 7, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-2 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 8, Parker et al. teaches "wherein said at least one earlier version of a document is stored in it's entirety . . . compressed form" (see page 2, paragraph [0030] and page 6, paragraphs [0148]-[0149]).

As per claims 9-11, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-3 and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 12-15, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-4 and are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

--As per applicant's argument regarding "Parker stores a particular version of a document and a delta for subsequent use . . . such actions teach nothing about how the requested and current version are stored . . .", examiner disagrees and refer applicant to Parker's abstract and paragraph [0006] which indicates how the various version are stored as implied in applicant's claim language.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alford W. Kindred whose telephone number is 571-272-4037. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9:00 am- 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Alford W. Kindred
Patent Examiner
Tech Ctr. 2100